



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

T.R.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/157,018 09/18/98 KILGORE

B MS-80

027662 TM02/1025
LYON, HARR & DEFRANK
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 800
OXNARD CA 93030

EXAMINER

LUU, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

17

DATE MAILED:

10/25/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

K

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/157,018

Applicant(s)

KILGORE, BENJAMIN

Examiner

Sy D Luu

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Request for Continued Examination and Amendment C, filed 8/12/2001 and 5/12/2001 respectively.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2 and 13 are independent claims. In the Amendment C, claims 1, 2 and 13 were amended. This action is made Non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maggioncalda et al. ("Maggioncalda", US # 6,012,044).

As per independent claims 1 and its dependent claim 10, Maggioncalda teaches a method for dynamically displaying data values, comprising:

transmitting results, sub-items associated with the results (col. 7, lines 10-14), and rules of enforcement of sub-item combinations (*constrained set of decisions*, col. 8, lines 35-50; col. 10, lines 16-19) in a predefined format from a server (*Simulation Module 340 residing on a server of the Financial Advisory System 300*, fig. 3) to a remote client through a communications interface (*User Interface 360 of a Client 105*, figures 1 and 3) in response to a request from the client to the server (col. 6, lines 15-21);

processing the results in real time using the client computer in response to user adjustment of the results and the sub-item configuration on the client computer (col. 8, lines 2-8); and

displaying a first set of results, and dynamically displaying the processed results on a client display device (col. 7, lines 56-59; col. 18, lines 4-7).

Maggioncalda does not explicitly disclose the method to comprise: preventing sub-item conflicts using the transmitted rules of enforcement; and the rules of enforcement for sub-item combination to be processed in the background. However, these step would have been inherent to a method such as Maggioncalda so as to allow the system to process transmitted results transparently to users and display sub-items in combination logically and properly, especially when they are mutually exclusive of each other.

Although Maggioncalda teaches the data values to be transmitted from a server to the client for processing in the form of a Java Applet to provide real time interactivity as noted at the bottom of the window in fig. 4, Maggioncalda does not teach the client to process the data values in real time in response to user adjustment of the data values and the sub-items for determining the specific results, wherein the client processing of the data values continues even after the communications interface between the server and client has been terminated. However, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to further include a set of possible results (*output values*) as part of the transmitted data values via the Java Applets as used by Maggioncalda in accordance to the user's initial request from the client to the server. Transmitting Java Applets comprising of all required data for completing a user's request would allow Maggioncalda's system with real time processing which eliminates the need to establish

further communications between the client and the server, which in effect would result in the continuation of client processing even after the communications interface between the server and client has been terminated. By limiting client/server interactions, improvements in reducing bandwidth requirements as well as reducing data latency would have been achieved.

Independent claims 2 and 13 are similar in scope to claim 1, in that all claims involve: a client requesting for data values to be transmitted from a server performing a database query; specific dynamic output results derived from the data values as a result of user adjustments in real time via an user interface in the client; and client processing to continue even after the communications interface between the server and client has been terminated.. Claim 15 further indicates that the data values are pricing data. Since Maggioncalda's financial advisory system provides users with an interactive tool for exploring with real-time "what if" scenarios based on user's adjustments of criteria in different areas of finance (col. 8, lines 42-50), Maggioncalda suggests for the system to be implemented in any related areas involving producing certain (*recommended*) results based on the user's manipulation of criteria, such as pricing. Claims 2 and 15 are therefore rejected under similar rationale as claim 1.

As per claims 3-4, Maggioncalda further discloses the adjustable interface tools to comprise input boxes for adjusting criteria of associated criteria in real time as well as the interface tools being controls in a dialog box (fig. 4, element 410; col. 8, lines 23-41).

As per claims 5, 8-9 and 15, Maggioncalda does not explicitly disclose the interface tools to include: dynamically coupled check boxes so that designated check boxes dynamically change as a user configures conflicting interface tools constrained by the logical rules of enforcement; at least one previously selected sub-items are automatically deselected when a user selects a new

Art Unit: 2173

sub-item which conflicts with the at least one previously selected sub-items; at least one additional sub-items to be automatically selected when a user selects a sub-item which requires selection of the at least one additional sub-items; and the pricing data and associated options are dynamically updated and displayed on the client display device in response to user interaction with the pricing data and associated options. However, these normal and expected features would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to be included in such an interface tools as that of Maggioncalda in order to aid and visually facilitate user interaction with a constrained set of decision variables.

As per claim 6, Maggioncalda discloses the GUI to have at least one graphical control for allowing the user to dynamically adjust the results and associated sub-items (fig. 4, *element 410*).

As per claim 7, Maggioncalda teaches the data values to comprise pricing data for at least one object, and the associated sub-items comprise user selectable options for the objects (fig. 4, *element 410*; col. 8, lines 23-50).

As per claim 11, the claim rejection of the limitation for the method, wherein remote processing of the results and associated sub-items to continue in response to user interaction with the results and associated sub-items on the client display device after the communications interface between the server and the client has been terminated, has been addressed in claim 1. Thus, this claim would be rejected under similar rationale..

As per claim 12, Maggioncalda discloses the GUI to have at least one graphical control for allowing the user to dynamically adjust the displayed data and sub-items (*slider bars and radio buttons*, fig. 4, *element 410*).

As per claim 14, the claim rejection of the limitation for the method, wherein the rules for selection and combination of the associated options automatically prevent user selection or combination of incompatible or conflicting options, has been addressed in claim 1. Thus, this claim would be rejected under similar rationale..

Claims 16-17 are similar in scope to claims 8-9 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 3/1/2001 with respect to claims 1, 2 and 13 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that Maggioncalda does not teach Applicants' claimed feature of the continuation of (client) processing even after the communications interface between the server and the client has been terminated.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons: since Maggioncalda teaches the controls as well as data values to be transmitted from a server to the client for processing in the form of a Java Applet to provide real time interactivity as noted at the bottom of the window in fig. 4, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to further include a set of possible results (*output values*) as part of the transmitted data values via the Java Applets as used by Maggioncalda in accordance to the user's initial request from the client to the server. Transmitting the Java Applets comprising of all required data for completing a user's request would allow Maggioncalda's system with real time processing which eliminates the need to establish further communications between the client and the server, which in effect would result

Art Unit: 2173

in the continuation of client processing even after the communications interface between the server and client has been terminated. By limiting client/server interactions, improvements in reducing bandwidth requirements as well as reducing data latency would have been achieved.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Luzzi et al. (US 6,175,832 B1) teaches a method for establishing a data reporting and display communication over a network.

Gish (US 6,233,620 B1) teaches an Object-oriented system, method and article of manufacture for a presentation engine in an enterprise computing framework system.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is (703) 305-0409. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm (EST). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Sy D. Luu

Patent Examiner

October 22, 2001